

With Smith slam-dunking, Simpkins soaring, Booth blasting-off, Hipp hopping and Rhodes rising to the occasion, the Terps beat an equally impressive North Carolina team.

Under the amazing coaching of Gary Williams, the Terrapins beat the top-ranked team in the Nation for the first time since 1986. We play them at least two times every year. They beat a North Carolina team, coached by the legendary Dean Smith, who, year after year, has produced champion basketball players.

From last year's sweet sixteen team to this year's top ten rankings and a tie for first place in the Atlantic Coast Conference, there is only one word to describe Maryland basketball—awesome.

Michael Wilbon of the Washington Post called it a night to remember. If last night's caliber of play by the mighty Maryland Terrapins is any indication of what we will be seeing in the near future, there are going to be many nights to remember for the players and fans of Maryland basketball.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is this an apology to the District for redistricting Mr. McMillen out of Congress?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. McMillen has been redistricted out of Congress, but he was five seats from me cheering on the Terrapins.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that these slanderous words be immediately taken down.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion.

THE TRUTH ABOUT FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO ALABAMA

(Mr. BROWDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I know it is difficult to correct a piece of misinformation once it is published, but I am going to try. Much attention has been directed in recent weeks to the impact of the balanced budget amendment on the finances of the various States. In that vein, several national publications have reported that my home State of Alabama led the nation, with 58 percent of its 1993 budget coming from the Federal Government.

That figure is amazing, but it is not true. The confusion results from a difference in Alabama's accounting system that was not adequately explained when the State's budget figures were reported in the national survey.

Mr. Speaker, I will include for the RECORD a letter from the Department of Finance of the State of Alabama showing that Federal funds accounted for 32 percent, not 58 percent, of Alabama's budget for fiscal year 1993.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE,
Montgomery, AL, January 27, 1995.

Hon. GLEN BROWDER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWDER: Recent news articles published by Newsweek and by Time on January 23, 1995, analyzed the Federal Balanced Budget Amendment and its effects on state finances. Both articles reflected that 58% of Alabama's Budget for fiscal year ending 1993 was received from the Federal Government. This information is not correct. Actual Federal revenues received by Alabama for the fiscal year ending in 1993 were \$2.74 billion and compared to total revenues received (from all sources) of \$8.52 billion is approximately 32 percent.

This confusion has been brought on by the data supplied to Newsweek and Time by the National Association of State Budget Officers in their "NASBO 1994 State Expenditure Survey—Fiscal Years 1992-94." Alabama provided data for the referenced NASBO survey, but our data was not adequately explained. Alabama included in the section for Federal Funds, expenditures from Federal funds, local funds, state earmarked funds, tuition, fees, grants and, contracts with a footnote to that effect. This footnote was included because expenditures are made from fund accounts made up of these various revenue sources thus precluding actual identification of each expenditure by source of funding. A reasonable estimation of the Federal percentage can be made from the revenue perspective of Alabama's accounting system and for FY 1993 is approximately 32 percent.

I wanted to clarify this data for you, so you would not base your vote on this issue on incorrect data.

Sincerely,

BILL NEWTON,
Assistant Finance Director.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KOLBE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GUTIERREZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MARTINI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CRIME LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a former prosecutor in Pennsylvania, I found today's discussions about addressing crime most illuminating. I have spent much of my life battling criminals in our courts and trying, in my own way to make the streets of my home—Montgomery County, PA—a little bit safer.

I have had the opportunity to witness the frustration of police officers, prosecutors, and judges as skillful defense attorneys have manipulated the system to place violent repeat criminals back on the streets despite overwhelming evidence against them.

I've seen families terrorized by the very memory of the unspeakable crimes against them and the reality that the perpetrators may be released by the system.

The bills considered by this body today will take a dramatic step forward to end the terror of victims and the frustration of law enforcement officials who are hamstrung by technicalities. H.R. 666, the Exclusionary Rule Reform Act is important and long-overdue legislation which will ensure that those guilty of violent crimes against other persons get exactly what they deserve, and that is time in prison.

Current law provides that a guilty defendant may be set free to again terrorize innocent victims based upon the exclusion of evidence seized by law enforcement officers who have acted in the good faith belief that their conduct did not violate the defendant's constitutional rights.

In such cases, the conduct of a police officer does not involve coercion of a confession or other wrongful conduct, but technical errors that have nothing to do with the defendant's guilt or innocence. The release of guilty defendants on technicalities makes a mockery of our society's laws. We need to place the rights of the victims above all else. When I served in the district attorney's office I prosecuted a case where a 12-year-old young lady was viciously and forcibly raped. She and her family were so traumatized by the violence of the crime that they never returned to that house.

My fellow members, I do believe that a person is innocent until found guilty but I don't believe in placing impediments to prosecution which have no basis in fact or law. H.R. 666 removes those impediments.

Finally, I would say the Effective Death Penalty Act H.R. 729 has been